

REMARKS

The present Amendment is supplemental to the Amendment dated November 9, 2006. Reconsideration and allowance of this application are respectfully requested. Claims 1-19 remain in this application and, as amended herein, are submitted for the Examiner's reconsideration.

In the final Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 5, 7, 10, 11 and 16 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Nickum (U.S. Patent No. 6,359,661). Claims 1, 10, and 11 have been amended in the present Amendment to more clearly show how the claims are patentably distinguishable over Nickum.

Nickum describes a multiple user profile remote control device in which:

Each remote control device 200 is assigned at least one unique user id which is stored in EEPROM 250. A user id comprises a predetermined sequence of alphanumeric keys for each user. In another embodiment, each remote control device 200 is assigned two or more unique ids. (Emphasis added.)

(See col.4 l.66 to col.5 l.3.) Nickum therefore describes a remote control device which is assigned and stores an ID that identifies a user. Because more than one user ID may be stored in a given remote control device, the user ID does not identify the remote control device. Moreover, even if only one user ID is stored in a remote control device and that user ID is not stored in any other remote control devices, the user ID does not identify only the remote control device because the user ID, by definition, also identifies a user. Therefore, Nickum does not disclose or suggest an identification number that identifies only a selected one of a plurality of control hardware portions, and Nickum does not disclose or suggest identification information that identifies only a given one of a plurality of control devices.

In the Advisory Action, the Examiner further relies on the section of Nickum at column 8, lines 34-46 which describes:

In an alternative embodiment, the user profile and programming restrictions are stored in circuitry within the television or an attached device such as a cable control box. Each remote control device has, instead of the circuitry described earlier (FIG. 2 and accompanying text, an individualized identifying signal incorporated in the conventional circuitry. Each user selection is then accompanied by the identifying signal, which is translated by the circuitry in the television or attached device in order to reference the proper user profile and assigned viewing restrictions....(Emphasis added.)

Namely, Nickum describes that the remote control device generates a signal that references a user profile. Hence, even if the remote control device generates only one such signal, the signal does not contain information that identifies only the cable control box.

Therefore, Nickum does not disclose or suggest:

transmitting, from the given one of the plurality of control devices to the information processing apparatus over the network, an identification number that identifies only the selected one of the plurality of controlled hardware portions and identification information that identifies only the given one of the plurality of control devices;

storing, in a control correspondence table of the information processing apparatus, the identification number that identifies only the selected one of the plurality of controlled hardware portions and the identification information that identifies only the given one of the plurality of control devices that were transmitted by the given one of the plurality of control devices such that the identification number that identifies only the selected one of the plurality of controlled hardware portions is associated with the identification information that identifies only the given one of the plurality of control devices;

repeating said selecting step, said transmitting step and said storing step using a further one of the plurality of control devices and a further one of the plurality of controlled hardware portions to associate the identification information that identifies only

the further one of the plurality of control devices with the identification number that identifies only the further one of the plurality of controlled hardware portions;

transmitting a control request from the given one of the plurality of control devices or from the further one of the plurality of control devices to the information processing apparatus over the network, the control request including the identification information that identifies only the transmitting control device;

referring to the control correspondence table to obtain the identification number that identifies only the controlled hardware portion of the information processing apparatus that is associated with the identification information that identifies only the transmitting control device; and

as called for in claim 1 (Emphasis added.)

It follows that the relied-on sections of Nickum do not disclose or suggest the method defined in claim 1 and therefore do not anticipate the claim.

Claims 5 and 7 depend from claim 1 and are each distinguishable over Nickum for at least the same reasons.

Independent claims 10 and 11 each include limitations similar to those set out above in the excerpts of claim 1. Therefore, each of claims 10 and 11 is distinguishable over Nickum at least for the same reasons.

Claim 16 depends from claim 10 is distinguishable over Nickum for at least the same reasons.

The Examiner also rejected claims 2, 4, 6, 8, 9, 13, 15 and 17 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nickum in further view of Croy; and rejected claims 3, 12, 14, 18 and 19 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nickum in further view of Humpleman.

Claims 2-4, 6, 8-9, and 12 depend from claim 1, claims 13-15 and 17-18 depend from claim 10, and claim 19 depends from claim 11. Each of these claims is therefore distinguishable over Nickum for at least the same reasons as the

claim from which it depends. Moreover, as pointed out in the prior Amendment, the relied-on sections of Croy and Humpleman do not remedy the above-described deficiencies of Nickum.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the rejections under §§ 102(e) and 103(a).

In view of the above, each of the presently pending claims in this application is believed to be in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the outstanding rejection of the claims and to pass this application to issue. If, however, for any reason the Examiner does not believe that such action can be taken at this time, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner telephone applicant's attorney at (908) 654-5000 in order to overcome any additional objections which the Examiner might have.

If there are any additional charges in connection with this requested amendment, the Examiner is authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 12-1095 therefor.

Dated: December 18, 2006

Respectfully submitted,


BY Lawrence E. Russ

Lawrence E. Russ
Registration No.: 35,342
LERNER, DAVID, LITTENBERG,
KRUMHOLZ & MENTLIK, LLP
600 South Avenue West
Westfield, New Jersey 07090
(908) 654-5000
Attorney for Applicant